LOUISIANA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT

FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

JULY 1, 2011 – JUNE 30, 2016

Revised June 30, 2010

Table of Contents

Vision, Mission, & Values…...……..3

Departmental Goals……...4

DOTD-Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats……5

Strategic Plan…….8

Appendix A: Principal Clients……..……..42

Appendix B: External Factors……..……..47

Appendix C: Duplication of Efforts…….……..50

Appendix D: Performance Indicator Documentation……..53

Appendix E: Strategy Analysis Checklist…….....141

Vision

To be a leader moving Louisiana forward

Mission

To deliver transportation and public works systems that enhances quality of life and facilitates economic growth.

Values

We are committed to earning the public's trust, holding to the highest moral, ethical, and professional standards.

People

We respect our coworkers for their dedication, skills, diversity, and responsible actions.

Excellence

We strive for high quality, ensuring the best product possible in a timely manner.

Leadership

We embrace our responsibilities and empower our people to succeed.

Public Service

We respond to the needs of our citizens, communities, and partners in a timely manner.

Accountability

We take responsibility for our performance.

Departmental Goals

Continually improve the performance of DOTD.

Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.

Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff.

Improve customer service and public confidence.

Effectively develop and manage our human resources.

Efficiently manage DOTD's financial resources.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats

The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development perceives its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to be vital components in effectively negotiating the future direction of the agency. The specific factors relative to this strategy include the following:

Strengths:

Identification of agency strengths allows DOTD to maximize its understanding of available tools so that it may create effective and viable operational and strategic plans.

- Committed, experienced and competent workforce.
- A structured training program that is designed to prepare employees for advancement.
- Culture of continuous performance improvement.
- Ability to manage resources to deliver transportation's regular program in addition to special funded programs (surplus funds, ARRA, etc).
- A Leader in economic recovery and development following a natural or man-made disaster.
- Corporate culture of honesty and integrity.
- Utilization of a formal Succession Planning Process takes into consideration the high number of employees eligible for retirement in upper and middle level management and supports groundwork for successors.

Weaknesses

Recognition of agency weaknesses affords DOTD an opportunity to adequately prepare for program and planning initiatives as well as to prepare for potential risks that may result from agency vulnerabilities.

- Lack of necessary equipment throughout agency or in specific sections or districts.
- Elected officials (e.g., Legislators, governing bodies, etc.) may not always be fully aware of transportation issues or fully consider implications of their decisions.
- Programs/districts/sections have been assigned additional tasks and responsibilities with insufficient Table of Organization (TO) to handle these duties.
- Irregular distribution of resources based on paradigms and outdated practices.

Opportunities

DOTD has several areas of opportunity in terms of funding sources and its ability to improve the transportation infrastructure throughout the state.

- A workforce committed to the betterment of Louisiana's programs.
- A strong partnership with Louisiana State Police, the Highway Safety Commission; and other Federal, State, and Local safety partners to reduce fatality rates and increase highway safety.
- A history of successful programs which are publicized and leveraged for public support.
- A strong partnership with industry.
- A strong partnership with the Department of Economic Development, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Natural Resources, Civil Service, local governments, Coastal Protection and Restoration, Academia, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).
- Strong relationships with executive and legislative branches of government.
- Pilot agency for the LaGov, ERP project.
- Programs or units within the agency lack understanding of program ownership thus creating pseudo silos which inhibits the information flow throughout the Department.
- Implement effective resource allocation within management practices.

Threats

LA DOTD perceives threats – both internal and external – as any factors that will impede its efforts to meet mandates, statutes, and regulations, and elevate its level of service. By recognizing and identifying these threats, DOTD can be aware of the complete operational consequences and anticipate future impacts.

- Difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified employees.
- High number of experienced employees eligible for retirement.
- Some sections/districts/programs are understaffed relative to the functions they provide and face additional TO reductions.
- Lack of a knowledge management system to capture and archive standard operating procedures, decision-making processes, procedures for infrequent tasks, and the evolution of the organizational culture and work processes.
- Inability to meet strategic objectives, including matching federal funds, due to flat revenue stream and the subsequent inability to keep up with inflationary factors.
- Continuation of Federal funding in jeopardy.
- Inadequate funding to maintain and/or reach public's desired level of service.
- Tort liability.

- Mandated deadlines (example: ARRA, Surplus, etc.).
- Insufficient State funds.

1. ADMINISTRATION

1.1. OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Authorized Positions: (98)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:504

Mission: To provide leadership, direction, and accountability for all DOTD programs in support of its mission

Program Description: Responsible for the overall direction and policy setting of the department.

Goal: Provide administrative direction and leadership, which will ensure that subordinate DOTD programs are managed to provide the optimum benefits and services to the public within the constraints of available funding and applicable regulations, and perform all operational functions with safety as a priority.

1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.

Strategies:

1.1.1.1. Identify technology to collect and process customer contact information.

1.1.1.1.1. Identify new web applications supporting customer inquiries and support.

1.1.1.1.2. Keep the general public and travelers informed of road work through planned community outreach programs.

1.1.1.1.3. Respond to media requests in a professional and timely manner by establishing a web media room with press releases, project/program information and photographs, etc.

1.1.1.1.4. Analyze DOTD's web site to better support internal and external customer needs.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Transparent, Accountable, and Effective Government				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 1.1.1: Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.	Number of emails received.	Number of emails responded to within three business days.	Percent of emails responded to within three business days.		.

1.1.2. Objective: Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.

Strategies:

1.1.2.1. Identify opportunities for cost-effective reductions of administrative expenses.

1.1.2.1.1. Analyze the administrative expenses Department wide.

1.1.2.1.2. Analyze workforce needs based on headcount allocations and program needs.

1.1.2.1.3. Analyze supply and travel budgets that are calculated as administrative expenses.

1.1.2.1.4. Analyze consultant contracts that are counted as administrative expenses.

1.1.2.1.5. Seek technological advances that can reduce administrative expenses.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Transparent, Accountable, and Effective Government				
Program Activity	Administration				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 1.1.2: Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.	Budgeted construction funds. Budgeted maintenance funds.	Actual administrative expenditures. Actual construction expenditures. Actual maintenance expenditures.	Administrative expenditures divided by total state controlled highway miles.		

1.2. OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

Authorized Positions: (196)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:501

Program Description: Provides department-wide support through its sections and programs including financial services, audit, budget, business services, facilities, procurement, project finance, quality and continuous improvement, and other management services.

Mission: To support the mission of DOTD by providing services that enables the success of all DOTD agencies, offices, and programs.

Goals:
Continually improve the performance of DOTD
Deliver Management & Finance products, projects & services in an efficient manner
Improve customer service and public confidence
Effectively develop and manage our human resources
Efficiently and effectively manage DOTD's financial resources
Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

1.2.1. Objective: Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

1.2.1.1. Establish a challenging retention goal in comparison to state average.

1.2.1.2. Analyze turnover rates by classification/geographical area on a quarterly basis

1.2.1.3. Increase use of agency special pay tools to target areas where pay is truly the issue.

1.2.1.4. Systematically conduct on-site meetings with targeted groups to determine issues other than pay which are causing high turnover

1.2.1.5. Revitalize DOTD's Exit Interview Process

1.2.1.6. Improve DOTD's employee recognition program to simplify the process and increase participation.

1.2.1.7. Conduct agency-wide employee satisfaction surveys every two years.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 1.2.1: Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Average number of vacant positions. Total number of approved positions.	Number of positions filled.	Reduction in turnover rate.	Number of positions filled over number of vacant positions.	

2. PUBLIC WORKS & INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

2.1. WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

Authorized Positions: (38)

Program Authorization: Directive of the Governor, Louisiana Revised Statutes Title 38: § L.R.S. 38:2; § L.R.S. 36:508; § L.R.S. 41:51; § L.R.S. 38:21–38:28; § L.R.S. 38:281–38:513; § L.R.S. 38:90.1-38:90.16; § L.R.S. 34:3451–34:3463; § L.R.S. 38:5; § L.R.S. 38:3094; § L.R.S. 38:30–38:34; § L.R.S. 38:3091.1: § L.R.S. 38:2226; § L.R.S. 38:3098–3898.8; § L.R.S. 38:3096(C); § L.R.S. 38:3091.8; § L.R.S. 38:1–38:19; § L.R.S. 38:508–38:509; § L.R.S. 38:90.4(A)(B)(C); § L.R.S. 38:91; PL 566, Section 60.25 of CRF 44, PL 104–303, R.S. 38:241-248, R.S. 38:501, R.S. 38:502, R. S. 49:213

Program Description: This program plans, develops, and manages the State's maritime infrastructure, and surface water resources in order to provide existing, and future, human and economic development needs. Additionally, the program identifies the needs and priorities for flood control and rail infrastructure and administers capital improvement projects.

Mission: The mission of this program is twofold:

1. Public Works: To develop the full potential of Louisiana's water-related resources by administering programs implementing infrastructure projects relating to controlling, developing, conserving, and protecting all aspects of the resources including water supply, drainage, flood control, maritime, and port infrastructure.

2. Intermodal Transportation: To continually improve Louisiana's Marine and Rail systems to provide an efficient, safe, and seamless Intermodal architecture to nurture economic development and enhance the quality of life.

Goals:
Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Public Works & Intermodal Transportation
Deliver cost effective products, projects and services in a timely manner for all the office's programs
Improve customer service and public confidence in the office's programs
Effectively develop and manage our human resources
Efficiently manage the office's financial resources
Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

2.1.1. Objective: To administer the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to ensure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

2.1.1.1. Use state funds as cost share for Port Construction and Development Priority Program projects that will provide to the state at least five times the state's investment.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth				
Program Activity	Program and Project Delivery				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 2.1.1: To administer the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.	State's share of construction expenditures.	Total benefits.	State's return on investment (ROI).		

2.1.2. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 80% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

2.1.2.1. Promote activities and projects eligible for CRS.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Hurricane Protection and Emergency Preparedness; Diversified Economic Growth				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Activity Support Services					
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 2.1.2: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System so that 80% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.	Number of flood insurance policyholders	Flood insurance policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions	Percentage of policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions.		

2.2. AVIATION

Authorized Positions: (11)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:507 (A) and § L.R.S. 2:802

Program Description: This program is responsible for airport and aviation safety, regulation, and capital improvement.

Mission: The Aviation Program has overall responsibility for facilitating, development, exercising regulatory oversight, and providing guidance for Louisiana's aviation system of over 650 public and private airports and heliports.

Goal: To continue to have a safe, modern, well-managed system of airports that provides convenient and efficient access to the state for tourism, commerce, industrial interest, and recreation. To continually modernize the State's public airports to meet the changing needs of the aviation community and the general public.

2.2.1. Objective: Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

2.2.1.1. Improve the condition of runways, taxiways, and aprons.

2.2.1.1.1. Encourage airports to participate in the Airport Maintenance Program.

2.2.1.1.2. Work to increase state funding for the Aviation Needs and Project Priority Program so that more infrastructure capital improvements projects can be initiated.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Transit				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 2.2.1: Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.	Number of airports with the PCI above the State Standard.	Number of airports who's PCI improved to above the State Standard.	Percentage of airports with PCI above the State Standard.		

2.3. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Authorized Positions: (12)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:501(c)

Program Description: Manages the State's programs for rural public transportation and metropolitan area transit planning. Most of this budget is financed with Federal funds and passed through to local agencies for capital and operating assistance for public transit systems serving the general public, elderly and disabled persons, and for metropolitan planning organizations.

Mission: To improve public transit in all areas of the state so that Louisiana's citizens may exercise an adequate level of personal mobility regardless of geographical location, physical limitation or economic status.

Goal: A public transportation system in all parishes by 2020.

2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

2.3.1.1. Maximize coordination efforts to minimize trip cost and optimize the use of automation in compiling transit statistics.

2.3.1.2. Survey agencies to determine additional needs.

2.3.1.3. Update inventory and condition of FTA funded vehicles in the fleet.

2.3.1.4. Develop and conduct workshops to train agencies.

2.3.1.5. Develop and monitor vehicle use and maintenance reports. Conduct site reviews to determine agency compliance with FTA regulations and provide feedback.

2.3.1.6. Develop a funding plan that includes local or state (non-federal) revenues to facilitate expansion of the public transportation program into two (2) additional parishes per year.

2.3.1.7. Identify funding sources to provide one-half of the match for available federal dollars to operate a rural transit system.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation				
Program Activity	Transit				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 2.3.1: To expand the public transportation services that provides low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.	The 64 Louisiana parishes.	Total number of participating parishes.	Number of additional participating parishes.		

3. OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS

3.1. OFFICE OF ENGINEERING

Authorized Positions: (631)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:507 (B) and Title 48

Program Description: This program provides planning, design, and construction of highways.

Mission: To develop and construct a safe, cost-effective and efficient highway system which will satisfy the needs of the motoring public and serve the economic development of the State in an environmentally compatible manner.

Goals:

Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Engineering

Deliver cost effective products, projects and services in a timely manner

Improve customer service and public confidence

Effectively develop and manage our human resources

Efficiently manage the financial resources available to the Office of Engineering

Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Strategies:

3.1.1.1. Determine the most current "measured" percentage at a fair or higher condition.

3.1.1.2. Present ride-ability data to management in graphic and tabular format.

3.1.1.3. In interim years (every two years), calculate P.I. by extrapolation of available data.

3.1.1.4. Compare needs to current budget partition and recommend budget revisions if necessary.

3.1.1.5. Review program pavement rehabilitation projects annually to achieve objective.

3.1.1.6. Review recommended projects with teams to select projects and develop letting program.

3.1.1.7. Complete development of Bridge Management System.

3.1.1.7.1. Generate inventory and condition data for all bridges.

3.1.1.7.2. Maintain and Evaluate BMS preservation models.

3.1.1.7.3. Utilize BMS to generate performance indicator data.

3.1.1.7.4. Utilize BMS to establish funding needs.

3.1.1.7.5. Determine needs for repair/rehabilitation/replacement.

3.1.1.7.6. Seek additional funding for lower cost preservation projects to slow migration of bridges to deficient classification.

3.1.1.8. Maintain Annual Statewide Bridge Preservation Program

3.1.1.8.1. Analyze and quantify statewide bridge preservation needs.

3.1.1.8.2. Annually update and prioritize the bridge program based on funds made available from all sources—maintain a continuous eight-year program with new projects added annually to meet program needs.

3.1.1.9. Maintain Bridge Preservation Program.

3.1.1.9.1. Analyze the District level preservation needs of the program.

3.1.1.9.2. Implement bridge preservation program in all districts.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Operations and Maintenance				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.1.1: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.	Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System.	Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in Interstate Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles for National Highway System.	Total number of miles for National Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in National Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide	Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide	Percentage of highway miles in Highways of Statewide		

	Significance.	Significance that have been improved.	Significance in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles of Regional Highway System.	Total number of miles of Regional Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in Regional Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete on the State system. Total number of bridges on the State system.	Number of bridges that are maintained to meet bridge safety rating requirements.	Percentage of Louisiana bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.		

3.1.2. Objective: Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.

Strategies:

3.1.2.1. Deliver quality construction plans for highway infrastructure.

3.1.2.2. Research further use of technology and outsourcing for better reallocation of DOTD's resources.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation				
Program Activity	Program and Project Delivery				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.1.2: Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.	Total number of Projects.	Number of projects delivered without addenda or change orders.	Percent of projects delivered without addenda or change orders.		

3.1.3. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.1.3.1. Maintain Project System (LaGov SAP) tracking system.

3.1.3.1.1. Ensure that all projects are entered into System (SAP).

3.1.3.2. Require executive level approval for changing or modifying project delivery date (PDD).

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.1.3: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Number of projects included in annual program.	Number of projects delivered on time (PDD).	Percentage of projects delivered on time.		

3.2 BRIDGE TRUST

Authorized Positions: (127)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 48:1091-48:1106 and § L.R.S. 48:1161-48:1167. Act No. 1 of the 1989 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature renamed the Mississippi River Bridge Authority's bridges to the Crescent City Connection whereupon the former Mississippi River Bridge Authority became the Crescent City Connection Division of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development.

Program Description: Responsible for operation and daily maintenance of the Crescent City Connection Division. Bridges include police traffic control activities and toll collections.

Mission: To plan, construct, operate, maintain, and police all transportation systems within the jurisdiction of Crescent City Connection Division (CCCD) as economically, safely, efficiently, and professionally as possible.

Goals:

Operate and maintain current transportation systems in an efficient manner.

Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

3.2.1. Objective: To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.2.1.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.

3.2.1.2. Efficiently operate toll collections

3.2.1.3. Research future toll collection opportunities

3.2.1.4 Develop the CCCD Police Force

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation				
Program Activity	Operations and Maintenance				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.2.1: To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.	Total operating costs.	Number of vehicles that use the facility.	Total operating cost per vehicle that uses the facility.		

3.3. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

Authorized Positions: (62)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:507 and Title 48. State Statute § L.R.S. 48:228 through 48:233, both inclusive. Federal Statute: Title 23

Program Description: This program is responsible for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning, highway project programming, highway needs assessment, mapping, highway safety policy and program development, bridge and pavement management system development, and highway inventory and traffic monitoring programs.

Mission: Provide strategic direction for a seamless, multimodal transportation system.

Goals: Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Planning and Programming

Deliver quality products, projects and services in a timely manner and for a reasonable cost

Improve customer service and public confidence

Effectively develop and manage our human resources

Efficiently manage the Office of Planning and Programming's financial resources and assist in managing DOTD's financial resources.

Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

3.3.1. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.3.1.1. Update the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan.

3.3.1.2. Continue public awareness/education efforts.

3.3.1.3. Seek funding from traditional and non-traditional sources.

*In July 2000, the DOTD initiated an effort to update the state's long-range transportation plan. The planning process has its foundations in public involvement. This was accomplished through an extensive outreach program that included two transportation conferences, consultations with eight advisory councils, a website, several newsletters, nine regional public presentations of the draft plan, and distribution of the draft plan to every public library in the state for review and comment. The planning process was guided by the Louisiana Investment in Infrastructure for Economic Prosperity (LIIEP) Commission created through Act 437 in 2001. The LIIEP Commission adopted the long-range transportation plan in 2003.

The Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan includes the policies, programs, and projects that are needed to strengthen the State's economy and improve the quality of life for Louisiana citizens. It addresses the movement of people and freight across all modes of transportation. The Plan can be accessed through the DOTD website: www.lastateplan.org.

In June 2007, an effort was initiated to report the status of implementation, update cost estimates, and make minor revisions to the plan.

In 2010, DOTD will initiate an effort to update the State's long-range transportation plan.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth; Public Safety; Transparent, Accountable, and Effective Government				
Program Activity	Program and Project Delivery				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.3.1: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Total number of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System	Number of elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.	Percent of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in current year.		

3.3.2. Objective: Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.

Strategies:

3.3.2.1. Biennially collect pavement condition data for all state highways.

3.3.2.2. Randomly collect pavement condition data for non-state roads.

3.3.2.3. Report data to FHWA for use in national highway needs assessments.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.3.2: Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.	Pavement condition data collected.	Developing strategies and guiding investment decisions.	Percent pavement condition reported quarterly.		

3.3.3. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.3.3.1. Implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) through a collaborative partnership with highway safety stakeholders such that the priorities, programs, and projects of each support the emphasis areas identified in the SHSP.

3.3.3.2. Improve the system utilized to track roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

3.3.3.3. Identify crash locations and corridors involving roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

3.3.3.4. Develop countermeasures to reduce roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

3.3.3.5. Program a minimum of $20 million in highway safety construction projects each fiscal year including countermeasures to reduce roadway departures, improve intersections, and improve pedestrian safety.

3.3.3.6. Manage the Department's annual Highway Safety Program.

3.3.3.7. Program a minimum of $8 million of highway-rail grade crossing safety improvement projects each fiscal year.

3.3.3.8. Manage the Department's annual Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety Program.

3.3.3.9. Implement the recommendations from the Work Zone Safety Task Force Report.

3.3.3.10. Provide Work Zone Training classes to DOTD/Contractor/Consultant/Law Enforcement personnel.

3.3.3.11. Develop a public information program for National Work Zone Awareness Week each fiscal year.

3.3.3.12. Work cooperatively and in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Louisiana Highway Safety Commission (LHSC), Louisiana State Police (LSP), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to develop and promote traffic safety programs involving engineering, education, and enforcement.

3.3.3.13. Develop, implement, and fund statewide traffic safety public information/education/awareness campaigns.

3.3.3.14. Improve the quality of traffic crash data.

3.3.3.15. Implement the Safe Routes to Schools and Local Road Safety Programs as per SAFETEA-LU.

3.3.3.16. Track and report all fatal motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana's public road system to NHTSA by administering the Fatality Analysis and Reporting System (FARS).

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.3.3: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads for the previous year.	Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads for the current year.	Percent reduction in annual number of traffic crash fatalities compared with the previous year.		

3.3.4. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.3.4.1. Identify abnormal crash locations annually.

3.3.4.2. Provide abnormal crash locations to DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers for annual study.

3.3.4.3. Review annual recommendations from DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers.

3.3.4.4. Prioritize projects based on the greatest safety benefit.

3.3.4.5. Recommend highway safety improvement projects to the Headquarters Highway Safety Project Selection Team for inclusion in the Department's Annual Highway Safety Program.

3.3.4.6. Conduct evaluation studies to determine program effectiveness.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.3.4: To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.	Pre-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.	Post-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.	Average percent reduction in crash rates at all safety improvement project locations.		
			Percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations.		

3.4. DISTRICT OPERATIONS

Authorized Positions: (3396)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 36:507; 48:259; 48:35

Program Description: Field activity of the department including maintenance, field engineering, and field supervision of capital projects; includes materials testing, striping, mowing, contract maintenance, ferry and movable bridge operations, traffic services operations and minor repairs. Engineering work includes traffic, water resources, aviation, design of overlay and interstate rehabilitation projects.

Mission: To efficiently plan, design, construct, and maintain a safe transportation network in cooperation with our public and private partners.

Goals:

Continuously improve the performance of the districts, division, and sections

Improve customer service and public confidence in the districts, division, and sections

Efficiently manage the financial resources of the districts, division, and sections

Effectively develop and manage the human resources of the districts, division, and sections

Deliver the products, projects, and services of the districts, division, and sections in a cost effective and timely manner

Enhance the safety and well-being of our citizens, visitors, and staff

3.4.1. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.4.1.1. Review and update the DOTD Emergency Operations Plan and Emergency Support Function (ESF) Plans by May 31 each fiscal year through 2013.

3.4.1.2. Provide training for all personnel assigned an emergency position (IS-100, IS-700 NIMS, position specific training).

3.4.1.3. Participate in local, state, and federal exercises.

3.4.1.4. Conduct an after action review following an actual event within two (2) weeks after response ends.

3.4.1.5. Conduct an after action review following a scheduled exercise within one (1) week of completion of the exercise.

3.4.1.6. Execution of plans for the protection of life and property in response to emergencies/disasters.

3.4.1.7. Properly document emergency response, emergency repairs, and permanent work to facilitate reimbursement.

3.4.1.8. Protect critical transportation infrastructure against threats.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Diversified Economic Growth; Hurricane Protection and Emergency Preparedness				
Program Activity	Support Services				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.4.1. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.	Total number of projects to be implemented	Number of projects implemented	Percentage of Projects implemented for each fiscal year		

3.4.2. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.4.2.1. Reduce equipment downtime.

3.4.2.2. Develop and implement a district-wide plan.

3.4.2.3 Monitor segments which fail to meet minimum requirements and warranties.

3.4.2.4 Develop pavement marking database using Agile Assets.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Operations and Maintenance				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.4.2 To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Total non-interstate line miles that are deficient.	Total non-interstate line miles that are re-striped.	Percentage of deficient non-interstate line miles re-striped.		

3.4.3. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.4.3.1. Environmental assessments and context sensitive design.

3.4.3.2. Mitigate traffic congestion with modified construction work schedules, roadway safety features, and customer service.

3.4.3.3 Highway access permit reviews and approvals.

3.4.3.4 Construction materials sampling and testing.

3.4.3.5. Drainage studies.

3.4.3.6. Solicit input from public.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation; Public Safety				
Program Activity	Operations and Maintenance				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.4.3 To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.	Total miles of Interstate highways.	Total miles of Interstate roadways that pavement markings meet or exceed performance requirements.	Percentage of Interstates that meet or exceed performance specifications.		

3.5. MARINE OPERATIONS

Authorized Positions (84)

Program Authorization: § L.R.S. 48:1091-48:1106; § L.R.S. 48:1161-48:1167

Program Description: Responsible for operation and daily maintenance of the Crescent City Connection Division ferries, including police traffic control activities and toll collections.

Mission: To operate and maintain the Crescent City Connection Division (CCCD) ferries economically, safely, efficiently, and professionally.

Goal: To provide safe and reliable transportation on these ferries as efficiently as possible and in as pleasant an environment as possible.

3.5.1. Objective: To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.

Strategies:

3.5.1.1. Conduct a more effective maintenance program.

3.5.1.2. Maintain and recondition ferry equipment to extend life.

3.5.1.3. Determine whether new or different types of equipment would improve operations.

3.5.1.4. Prepare a list of equipment needs.

3.5.1.5. Request funding for equipment needs.

3.5.1.6. Train personnel in the use and care of all equipment.

Supports State Outcome Goals	Transportation				
Program Activity	Ferries				
Objective	**Input**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Efficiency**	**Quality**
Objective 3.5.1: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.	Total number of scheduled crossings during a period.	Total number of actual crossings during a period.	Percentage of actual crossings during a given period.		

Department of Transportation and Development

APPENDIX A

Principal Clients

Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan Principal Clients

Objective	Principal Clients
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, Districts, Public Relations Department External Clients – Public Officials, MPOs, Federal Highway Administration, Federal and State Resource and Regulatory Agencies, the motoring public
1.1.2. Objective: Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, Department Heads External Clients – DOA, the Legislature, and the general public
1.2.1. Objective: Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Workforce, Executive Committee External Clients – Elected officials, MPOs, and the motoring public.
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee External Clients – Citizens who will benefit from jobs created/retained, Louisiana industries, community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, the Port Authority, the Port Association of Louisiana (PAL), the Governor, the Legislature, and federal and state regulatory agencies.
2.1.2. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee External Clients – Flood insurance policyholders, FEMA, Corps of Engineers, levee boards, Congress, the Legislature, and the Governor.

2.2.1. Objective: Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Workforce, Office of Planning and Programming External Clients – Citizens who will benefit from jobs created/retained, Louisiana industries, external clients, MPOs, community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, Port Authority, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Governor, the Congress, the Legislature, the Federal Transit Authority (FTA), federal and state regulatory agencies, and federal and state Offices of Economic Development.
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Administration, Office of Planning and Programming External Clients – Federal Transit Authority (FTA), the Governor, Congress, the Legislature local governments, and transit agencies.
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.	Internal Clients – DOTD Workforce, Executive Committee External Clients – Louisiana industries, external clients, the motoring public, MPOs, LTA, FWHA, American Trucking Association, Community Rating System, the Governor, the Congress, the Legislature, and federal and regulatory agencies.
3.1.2. Objective: Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee External Clients – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public
3.1.3. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee External Clients – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public
3.2.1. Objective: To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Crescent City Connection District, DOTD Administration External Clients – Internal Auditors, the motoring public

3.3.1. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, Program Managers External Clients – The public, elected officials, MPOs, business and industry, LIIEP Commission, Transportation Advisory Councils, and the Federal Highway Administration
3.3.2. Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, District Administrators, Capacity Project Selection Team External Clients – The public, elected officials, MPOs, business and industry, and the Federal Highway Administration
3.3.3 To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, District Traffic Engineers, Traffic Safety Project Selection Team External Clients – Motoring public, Federal Highway Administration, Louisiana Highway Safety Commission, Operation Lifesaver, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD), the insurance industry, etc
3.3.4. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – Executive Committee, District Traffic Engineers, Traffic Safety Project Selection Team External Clients – Motoring public, the Federal Highway Administration
3.4.1. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts External Clients – Elected officials, the general public, MPOs, business and industry
3.4.2. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts External Clients – Elected officials, the motoring public
3.4.3. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.	Internal Clients – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts External Clients – Elected officials, the motoring public, and the tourism industry.
3.5.1. Objective: To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime	Internal Clients – DOTD Administration, Internal Auditors

	during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.	External Clients – Legislative Auditors and the motoring public

Department of Transportation and Development

APPENDIX B

External Factors

Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan External Factors

Objective	External Factors
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.	-Number of customer email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs -Responses to customer correspondence
1.1.2. Objective: Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.	-Available budget -Personnel costs -Benefit costs Controlled Miles.
1.2.1 Objective: Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	-Available workforce -Salary levels -Competition from consultants -Workforce job satisfaction
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.	-Program authorization -Global market
2.1.2. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.	-Program authorization -Weather
2.2.1. Objective: Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.	-Lack of state or local resources to match federal funds for capital improvement -Inadequate federal funds to meet the demands of proposed airport projects
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.	-Lack of state and/or local resources to match federal funds to operate a system. -Inadequate federal funds to expand into additional parishes.
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better	-Insufficient funds to meet goals -Catastrophic weather/environmental conditions

condition each Fiscal Year.	
3.1.2. Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.	-Timely review of plans and specifications
3.1.3. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	-Budget -Projects chargeable costs associated with Right-of-way and utility locations -R/R agreement -Corp of Engineer (COE) permits
3.2.1. Objective: To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.	-Inflation -Workforce availability
3.3.1. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	-Funding for Plan implementation -Legislation to enact policy elements
3.3.2 Objective: Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.	-Funding -Available workforce
3.3.3. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	-Funding for safety campaigns and improvement projects, law enforcement, and driver education
3.3.4. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.	-Funding for safety improvement projects
3.4.1. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.	-Available workforce -Budget
3.4.2. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	-Workforce availability -Weather -Material costs -Properly working equipment
3.4.3. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.	-Workforce availability -Available federal and state funds -Material costs
3.5.1. Objective: To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016	-Availability of funding sources -Projected maintenance costs of ferry equipment (labor and parts) -Projected staffing level need to achieve goals

Department of Transportation and Development

APPENDIX C

Duplication of Efforts

Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan Duplication of Efforts

Objective	Duplication of Efforts
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.	None
1.1.2. Objective: Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16..	None
1.2.1 Objective: Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	None
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.	No other state agency has a competitive and statewide program to partner with public port authorities to provide port infrastructure.
2.1.2. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.	No other state agency has a competitive and statewide program to partner with the Corps of Engineers to provide flood control infrastructure.
2.2.1. Objective: Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs these tasks or exercises control over public aviation statewide.
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises control over public transit systems statewide.
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.	No other agencies maintain state roads; several parishes have minimal impact on ride-ability quality maintenance work.
3.1.2. Objective: Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.

3.1.3. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.2.1. Objective: To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises the control on a statewide basis for the Bridge Trust.
3.3.1. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016	No other State agency or department is responsible for monitoring the progress on the overall plan implementation.
3.3.2. Objective: Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.	No other State agency or department is responsible for monitoring and reporting pavement condition.
3.3.3. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	Overall highway safety is a joint responsibility among any Federal, State, local government agencies, and civic and industry organizations. The DOTD works with our partners to ensure coordination and avoid duplication.
3.3.4. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.	No other agency or department conducts site-specific crash rate evaluations of safety improvements.
3.4.1. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.	DOTD's Emergency Management Plan is done in conjunction with the State's Emergency Operations Plan and the Governor's Office of Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness (GOHSEP).
3.4.2. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the task or exercises the control on statewide basis.
3.4.3. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the task or exercises the control on statewide basis.
3.5.1. Objective: To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises control of this Marine Trust.

Department of Transportation and Development

APPENDIX D

Performance Indicator Documentation

Performance Indicator Documentation

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.

Indicator: Percentage of correspondence responded to within three business days.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To account for the Department's ability to respond to email inquires received in a timely manner.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is maintained by Public Affairs and Customer Service. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Simple calculation of number of emails received and number of emails responded to within three business days.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The manager of the Customer Service Program and the Public Relations Director
9. Indicator Limitations:	Yes, to the extent of the data reliability capturing mechanisms.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.

Indicator: Number of email inquiries received.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To account for the number of emails the Department receives.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is maintained by Public Affairs and Customer Service. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly..
5. Calculation Methodology:	Simple tracking system of the number of emails received.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Public Relations Director and Customer Service Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service by responding to all email correspondence directed to customer service/public affairs with three business days.

Indicator: Number of email inquiries responded to within 3 business days.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To account for the number of email inquiries responded to in a timely manner.
3. Indicator Source:	It is a tracking system of public inquiries.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally. The calculation is standard.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Public Affairs Director and the Customer Service Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	It is dependent upon the completeness and accuracy of information provided to Public Affairs and Customer Service by other DOTD programs/sections.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.2. Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.

Indicator: Percent of administrative expenditures to construction/maintenance expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is a measured ratio.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Financial Systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs. Indicator allows management to gauge how Louisiana compares to other states.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.2. Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.

Indicator: Administrative Expenditures

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total operating budget.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Financial Systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.2. Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.

Indicator: Construction Expenditures

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total operating budget.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Financial Systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.2. Limit administrative expenses to $4500 per mile for Fiscal Year 11, $4500 FY 12, TBD FY 13, TBD FY 14, TBD FY 15, TBD FY 16.

Indicator: Maintenance Expenditures

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total operating budget.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Financial Systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percent turnover.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the overall turnover rate.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the Human Resources Department. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The data is collected on an ongoing basis and is reported on a quarterly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The data will be used by management to formulate initiatives to attract and retain employees.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total positions.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To use as an overall target for staffing levels.
3. Indicator Source:	The Legislature approves the approved number of positions for the department as indicated in the DOTD budget. It is a very reliable indicator.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The total is set at the beginning of the fiscal year and does not change.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The number of positions is a simple count.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Approved positions refer to the number of positions within each budget unit that have been approved by the Legislature.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used by management to determine the number of approved positions.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Deliver better, cleaner, safer and less congested modes of transportation by sustaining a highly skilled workforce at all levels with the Department by maintaining an overall turnover rate of 12% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total vacated positions.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Measures TO
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator is maintained by the Human Resources Department. It is a very reliable indicator.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The data is collected continuously and is reported on a quarterly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	Management at all levels will use this figure to gauge the effectiveness of recruiting and retention efforts.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: State's share of construction expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The number of program benefits is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	A quarterly report is produced which shows the expenditures to date for the program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total benefits.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The amount of funds expended is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	A quarterly report is produced which shows the expenditures to date for all the programs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: State's return on investment (ROI)

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The ROI is a measure of the outcome of the state's investment.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The state's share of construction expenditures for each project for the period is multiplied by the benefit-cost ration of each project and totaled. This total is then divided by the total state expenditures for the period. The ROI will be reported as an average return on investment of state dollars for all projects during the period. For example, five dollars return for one dollar invested.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 80% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of flood insurance policyholders.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a measurement of participation in the NFIP Program.
3. Indicator Source:	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, using Federal fiscal year dates.
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to establish the baseline number of insurance policyholders.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 80% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Flood insurance policyholders receiving rate reductions

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a measurement of participation in the NFIP-CRS Program. It is the number of flood insurance policy holders in a community that are participating in the NFIP-CRS program who receive rate reductions.
3. Indicator Source:	FEMA
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, using Federal fiscal year dates
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of the Louisiana Floodplain Management Program, to manage the program's resources, and in scheduling community visits and community contact frequency.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 80% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Percentage of participation in the NFIP-CRS program; all flood insurance policyholders in a community participating in the NFIP-CRS program who receive rate reductions.
3. Indicator Source:	FEMA
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, based on the Federal fiscal year
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of the Louisiana Floodplain Management Program, to manage the program's resources, and in scheduling community visits and community contact frequency.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of airports with PCI above the State Standard.

1. Indicator Type:	Input

2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their ability to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Further, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.

3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used to quarterly apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.

4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.

5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.

6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None

7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate

8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather, etc.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration to each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of airports who's PCI improved to above the State Standard.

1. Indicator Type:	Output

2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their abilities to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Furthermore, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.

3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used quarterly to apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.

4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.

5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.

6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None

7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate

8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather, etc.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration of each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve aviation safety related infrastructure for public airports to ensure 93% meet or exceed Pavement Condition Index (PCI) standards through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of airports with PCI above the State Standard.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome

2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their ability to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Further, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.

3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used quarterly to apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.

4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.

5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.

6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None

7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate

8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather,

	etc.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration to each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add "new start" systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the additional number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section's progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total number of participating parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add "new start" systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the total number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section's progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of additional participating parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add "new start" systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the additional number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section's progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.
9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other

	limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles for National Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles of Regional Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles for National Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of miles of Regional Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Interstate Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in National Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Highways of Statewide Significance in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Regional Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete on the state system.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the population of deficient bridges for which improvements are to be made.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Engineering gathers and maintains this data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simply tally of the number of bridges not meeting safety and structural integrity standards.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Total number of bridges on the State system.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the total number of bridges in the state system in order to enable percentage calculations for the number of obsolete/deficient bridges and the percent maintained and/or improved.
3. Indicator Source:	Design and Maintenance Sections track this data
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the number of bridges in the State system.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement

making and Agency processes:	of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Number of bridges that are maintained to meet bridge safety rating requirements.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a basis for which the agency can determine percentage of bridges that are improved to conditions such that they are no longer structurally deficient or obsolete.
3. Indicator Source:	Design and Maintenance Sections track the data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that the system stays in its current or better condition each Fiscal Year.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater
National Highway System – 95% or greater
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater
Bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete – 25% or less

Indicator: Percentage of Louisiana bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides progress information relative to the DOTD's efforts to improve conditions of bridges on the state system.
3. Indicator Source:	Maintenance units maintain this data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete divided by the total number of bridges in the state system.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement

making and Agency processes:	of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.

Indicator: Total number of projects.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This figure provides the population number for the total projects in the annual program and will be used for comparison purposes to measure progress.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to proved information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.

Indicator: Number of projects delivered without addenda or change orders.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Plan quality improvement will result in a greater percentage of plans delivered on time and reduce changes during construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Yes Change Orders- Approved changes to plans during construction.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator relies on accuracy and timeliness of data received from contractors, construction division and contract services.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Provide feedback to Design Section on performance and adds input for consultant rating index.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Deliver 25% active projects without addenda or change orders due to design errors each Fiscal Year.

Indicator: Percent projects delivered without addenda or change orders.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Plan quality improvement will result in a greater percentage of plans delivered on time and reduce changes during construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Percentage
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Yes Change Orders – Approved changes to plans during construction.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator relies on accuracy and timeliness of data received from contractors, construction division and contract services.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Provide feedback to Design Section on performance and adds input for consultant rating index.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of projects included in annual program.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This figure provides the population number for the total projects in the annual program and will be used for comparison purposes to measure progress.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to proved information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of projects delivered on time (by PDD).

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides an indication of the amount of work conducted/completed
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to proved information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of projects delivered on time.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides measure of percentage of projects completed in scheduled timeframe.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	A standard percentage calculation: the number of projects delivered divided by the number of projects included in annual program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to proved information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total operating costs.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the bridge-related operating costs.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report and budget status report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the total operating cost for the facility including personnel, supplies, contracted services, debt payments, and major repairs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction, therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply the transactions by two.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll Departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Limitations are in the manual entry of coding expenditures which could result in errors in the total operating expenditures.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of vehicles that use the facility.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the number of vehicles that use the facility.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total number of vehicles that use the facility during a certain period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction; therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply the transactions by two.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll Departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Input equipment failure can result in fewer vehicles being recorded than how many actually crossed the bridge.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize the CCCD bridge-related operations costs by maintaining a cost per vehicle of $0.30 or less by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total operating cost per vehicle that uses the facility.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the total operating cost per vehicle, which indicates the efficiency of the operation.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple calculation of the total operating cost divided by the number of vehicles that use the facility during a certain period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction; therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply by 2.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Input equipment failure can result in fewer vehicles being recorded than those that actually crossed the bridge.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total number of elements of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish a baseline from which progress can be measured.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Planning and Programming; the source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The plan was reviewed to identify distinct elements. It is a simple count of the total number of elements.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	A plan element refers to distinct recommendations concerning policies, programs, or projects.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator will provide a baseline for measuring the progress on the Plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To track the progress implementation of individual plan elements.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Planning and Programming
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of plan elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded).
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The outcome indicator will be used to monitor implementation progress of the entire plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percent of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure progress on the implementation of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains records on plan implementation. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The outcome is a simple percentage obtained by dividing the number of plan elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current fiscal year by the total number of plan elements and multiplying by 100.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Plan element refers to distinct recommendations concerning policies, programs, or projects.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Indicator will be used to monitor progress on the overall implantation of the Plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.2. Monitor and report on a quarterly basis the pavement condition in support of DOTD's pavement preservation objectives each Fiscal Year.

Indicator: Percent pavement condition reported quarterly.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the data for calculating the percentage reported.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Indicator will be used to support DOTD's pavement preservation objectives.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads from the previous year.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the values of the required variables for calculating the percent reduction in number of fatalities.
3. Indicator Source:	The source for this indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section and the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The annual number of fatalities is a simple count of the fatalities occurring in one year. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and official published documentation.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The number of fatalities can be categorized, such as the number of roadway departure fatalities, to help determine where to place the greatest emphasis for safety campaigns and improvements. The total number will be used to calculate the percent reduction when compared with the total from the previous year.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads from the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the values of the required variables for calculating the percent reduction in number of fatalities.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	The annual number of fatalities is a simple count of the fatalities occurring in one year. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and official published documentation
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The number of fatalities can be categorized, such as the number of roadway departure fatalities, to help determine where to place the greatest emphasis for safety campaigns and improvements. The total number will be used to calculate the percent reduction when compared with the total from the previous year.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percent reduction in annual number of traffic crash fatalities compared with the previous year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure progress in reducing the number of traffic crash fatalities in Louisiana.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section and the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The previous year's number of fatalities is subtracted from the current year's number of fatalities divided by the previous year's fatalities then multiplied by 100 to equal the percent change. This is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and the official published documents.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The outcome indicator will be used to monitor progress in reducing the number of traffic crash fatalities in Louisiana and in the allocation of the available construction budget among safety and other types of projects.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Pre-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish before and after crash performance at individual safety improvement project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-improvement and post-improvement crash rates are each based on three years of crash data. The crash rate is the number of crashes divided by the miles driven (in millions) within the project limits over a three-year period. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation of the indicator is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash performance.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator can be used to establish before and after crash rates for individual safety improvement measures.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Post-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish before and after crash performance at individual safety improvement project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-improvement and post-improvement crash rates are each based on three years of crash data. The crash rate is the number of crashes divided by the miles driven (in millions) within the project limits over a three-year period. It is a standard calculation
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator can be used to establish before and after crash rates for individual safety improvement measures.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish the percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations in order to calculate the average reduction for all project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-crash rate is subtracted from the post-crash rate and then divided by the pre-crash rate and multiplied by 100 to equal the percent change. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The crash rate is the number of crashes per 1 million miles driven and is the standard calculation used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and throughout the engineering profession.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator's limitation is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash rates.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The output indicator will be used to measure the effectiveness of different types of safety improvement measures.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2016

Indicator: Average percent reduction in crash rates for all safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the effectiveness of highway safety improvement projects.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and the safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by dividing the summation of the output data by the number of safety improvement projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The crash rate is the number of crashes per 1 million miles driven and is the standard calculation used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and throughout the engineering profession.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator's limitation is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash rates.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The output indicator will be used for capital funding allocation and for the selection of safety improvement measures at individual sites.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total number of projects to be implemented.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements.
3. Indicator Source:	Total number of projects to be implemented as developed by Director.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summary total of projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Number of projects implemented

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements, ensure that established federal and state standards are met, and that all performance requirements meet designated timelines.
3. Indicator Source:	Reports generated on a schedule determined by the director of the program.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summary of plans implemented
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of projects implemented each fiscal year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements, ensure federal and state standards are met, and that all performance requirements meet designated timelines.
3. Indicator Source:	Reports are generated on a schedule determined by the Director of the program.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally of calculation
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total line miles that are deficient.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the total number of non interstate line miles that are deficient on roadways in the state, excluding the Interstate.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of non-interstate line miles that are measured to be deficient.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To measure current status of painted non-interstate line miles.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total line miles that are re-striped.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-striped.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-striped.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	District Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The objective is influenced by external factors such as funding, equipment, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To measure performance and prioritize funding.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of deficient line miles that have been re-striped.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the percentage of deficient non-interstate line miles that have been re-striped.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-striped versus the total that are deficient.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	District Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The objective is influenced by external factors such as funding, equipment, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	To measure performance and prioritizing funding.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total miles of Interstate roadways.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a total number of Interstate roadways in the state.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of miles of Interstate roadways in the state.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis to measure performance and prioritize funding.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total miles of Interstate roadway that pavement markings meet or exceed performance requirements.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a total of Interstate roadways in the state that meet or exceed performance requirements.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of miles of Interstate roadways in the state that meet or exceed performance requirements.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator limitation is funding.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis for measuring performance and allocating funds.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to ensure that 90% of all interstate roadways meet or exceed performance specifications by June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of Interstate roadways that meet or exceed performance specifications for roadway markings.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the percentage of Interstate roadways that meet or exceed performance for pavement markings.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The total interstate roadway miles that meet or exceed performance specifications for markings is divided by the total number of interstate roadway miles in the state. The result is converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Traffic Operations within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is limited by funding, weather, and an adequate workforce.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis for the allocation of funds.

Program: Ferries

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total number of scheduled crossings during a period.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Represents the number of crossings that were scheduled during operating hours for a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The standard calculation is created from adding the total number of scheduled crossings.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	The information is gathered manually, human error, and the transposition of numbers during the data entry stage are all limitations to this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Program: Ferries

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Total number of actual crossings during a period.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the number of crossing that were made during operating hours during in a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The standard calculation is created by adding the total number of scheduled crossings minus the total number of actual crossings.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	Information is gathered manually, human error, and the transposition of numbers during data entry are all limitations of this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is primarily an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Program: Ferries

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain CCCD ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2016.

Indicator: Percentage of actual crossings during a given period.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It represents the percentage of crossings that were not made during operating hours for a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Dividing the total number of crossings not made due to operational downtime by the total scheduled crossings for a period creates the standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District.
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitations to this indicator include the manually gathering of information, human error, and the transposition of numbers during data entry.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	It is primarily an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Department of Transportation and Development

APPENDIX E

Strategy Checklist Documentation

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY	
Strategy: 1.1.1.1. Identify technology to collect and process customer contact information**.**	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY	
Strategy: 1.1.2.1. Identify opportunities for cost-effective reductions of administrative expenses.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.1. Establish a challenging retention goal in comparison to state average.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.2. Analyze turnover rates by classification/geographical area on a quarterly basis.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.3. Increase use of agency special pay tools to target areas where pay is truly the issue.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.4. Systematically conduct on-site meetings with targeted groups to determine issues other than pay which are causing high turnover.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☐ Authorization Exists ☒ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☐ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☐ Already Ongoing ☒ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.5. Revitalize DOTD's Exit Interview Process.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.6. Improve DOTD's employee recognition program to simplify the process and increase participation.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	
Strategy: 1.2.1.7. Conduct agency-wide employee satisfaction surveys every two years.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.1.1.1. Use state funds as cost share for Port Construction and Development Priority Program projects that will provide to the state at least five times the state's investment.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☒ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.1.2.1. Promote activities and projects eligible for CRS.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION AVIATION	
Strategy: 2.2.1.1. Improve the condition of runways, taxiways, and aprons.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.1. Maximize coordination efforts to minimize trip cost and optimize the use of automation in compiling transit statistics	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.2. Survey agencies to determine additional needs.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.3. Update inventory and condition of FTA funded vehicles in the fleet.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.4. Develop and conduct workshops to train agencies.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.5. Develop and monitor vehicle use and maintenance reports. Conduct site reviews to determine agency compliance with FTA regulations and provide feedback.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.6. Develop a funding plan that includes local or state (non-federal) revenues to facilitate expansion of the public transportation program into two (2) additional parishes per year.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☐ Authorization Exists ☒ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☐ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☐ Already Ongoing ☒ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	
Strategy: 2.3.1.7. Identify funding sources to provide one-half of the match of the federal dollars to operate a transit system.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☐ Authorization Exists ☒ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☐ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☐ Already Ongoing ☒ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.1. Determine the most current "measured" percentage at a fair or higher condition.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.2. Present ride-ability data to management in graphic and tabular format.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.3. In interim years (every two years), calculate P.I. by extrapolation of available data.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.4. Compare needs to current budget partition and recommend budget revisions if necessary.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.5. Review program pavement rehabilitation projects annually to achieve objective.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.6. Review recommended projects with teams to select projects and develop letting program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.7. Complete development of Bridge Management System.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.8. Maintain Annual Statewide Bridge Preservation Program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.1.9. Maintain Bridge Preservation Program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.2.1. Deliver quality construction plans for highway infrastructure.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.2.2. Research further use of technology and outsourcing for better reallocation of DOTD's resources.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.3.1. Maintain Project System (LaGOV SAP) tracking system.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☐ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS OFFICE OF ENGINEERING	
Strategy: 3.1.3.2. Require executive level approval for changing or modifying project delivery date (PDD).	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☐ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS BRIDGE TRUST	
Strategy: 3.2.1.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resources Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS BRIDGE TRUST	
Strategy: 3.2.1.2. Efficiently operate toll collections.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resources Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS BRIDGE TRUST	
Strategy: 3.2.1.3. Research future toll collection opportunities.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resources Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS BRIDGE TRUST	
Strategy: 3.2.1.4. Develop the CCCD Police Force.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resources Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.1.1. Update the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.1.2. Continue public awareness/education efforts.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.1.3. Seek funding from traditional and non-traditional sources.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☒ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.2.1. Biennially collect pavement condition data for all state highways.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.2.2. Randomly collect pavement condition for non-state roads.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.2.3. Report data to FHWA for use in national highway needs assessments.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.1. Implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) through a collaborative partnership with highway safety stakeholders such that the priorities, programs, and projects of each support the emphasis areas identified in the SHSP.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.2. Improve the system utilized to track roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.3. Identify crash locations and corridors involving roadway departures fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.4. Develop countermeasures to reduce roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.5. Program a minimum of $20 million in highway safety construction projects each fiscal year including countermeasures to reduce roadway departures, improve intersections, and improve pedestrian safety.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☐ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☒ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.6. Manage the Department's annual Highway Safety Program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.7. Program a minimum of $8 million of highway-rail grade crossing safety improvement projects each fiscal year.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☒ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.8. Manage the Department's annual Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety Program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.9. Implement the recommendations from the Work Zone Safety Task Force Report.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.10. Provide Work Zone Training classes to DOTD/Contractor/Consultant /Law Enforcement personnel.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.11. Develop a public information program for National Work Zone Awareness Week each fiscal year.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.12. Work cooperatively and in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Louisiana Highway Safety Commission (LHSC), Louisiana State Police (LSP), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to develop and promote traffic safety programs involving engineering, education, and enforcement.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.13. Develop, implement, and fund statewide traffic safety public information/education/awareness campaigns.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.14. Improve the quality of traffic crash data.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.15. Implement the Safe Routes to Schools and Local Road Safety Programs as per SAFETEA-LU.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.3.16. Track and report all fatal motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana's public road system to NHTSA by administering the Fatality Analysis and Reporting System (FARS).	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.1. Identify abnormal crash locations annually.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.2. Provide abnormal crash locations to DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers for annual study.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.3. Review annual recommendations from DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.4. Prioritize projects based on the greatest safety benefit.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☐ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.5. Recommend highway safety improvement projects to the Headquarters Highway Safety Project Selection Team for inclusion in the Department's Annual Highway Safety Program.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
Strategy: 3.3.4.6. Conduct evaluation studies to determine program effectiveness.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.1. Review and update the DOTD Emergency Operations Plan and Emergency Support Function (ESF) Plans by May 31st each year.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.2. Provide training for all personnel assigned an emergency position (IS-100, IS-700 NIMS, position specific training).	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.3. Participate in local, state, and federal exercises.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.4. Conduct an after action review following an actual event within two (2) weeks after response ends.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.5. Conduct an after action review following a scheduled exercise within one (1) week of completion of the exercise.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.6. Execution of plans for the protection of life and property in response to emergencies/disasters.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.7. Properly document emergency response, emergency repairs, and permanent work to facilitate reimbursement.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.1.8. Protect critical transportation infrastructure against threats.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.2.1. Reduce equipment downtime.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.2.2. Develop and implement a district-wide plan.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.2.3. Monitor segments which fail to meet minimum requirements and warranties.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.2.4. Develop pavement marking database using Agile Assets.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.1. Environmental assessments and context sensitive design	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.2. Mitigate traffic congestion with modified construction work schedules, roadway safety features, and customer service..	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.3. Highway access permit reviews and approvals.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.4. Construction materials sampling and testing.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.5. Drainage studies.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DISTRICT OPERATIONS	
Strategy: 3.4.3.6. Solicit input from public.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.1. Conduct a more effective maintenance program.	
☒ Analysis	☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☒ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.2. Maintain and recondition ferry equipment to extend life.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.3. Determine whether new or different types of equipment would improve operations.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☐ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☐ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.4. Prepare a list of equipment needs.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.5. Request funding for equipment needs.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☒ Other Analysis Used ☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☐ Means of Finance Identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS FERRIES	
Strategy: 3.5.1.6. Train personnel in the use and care of all equipment.	
☒ Analysis	☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted ☐ Other Analysis Used ☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered
☒ Authorization	☒ Authorization Exists ☐ Authorization Needed
☒ Organizational Capacity	☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified ☒ Resource Needs Identified
☒ Time Frame	☒ Already Ongoing ☐ New Startup Date Estimated ☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified
☒ Fiscal Impact	☒ Impact on Operating Budget ☐ Impact on Capital Outlay ☒ Means of Finance Identified